

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 SEPEHR TORABI, ) Civil No. 09cv2838 JAH (BLM)  
11 )  
12 Plaintiff, ) ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
13 v. ) MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE  
14 WASHINGTON MUTUAL BANK, et al, )  
15 Defendants. )  
16 \_\_\_\_\_ )

17 *Pro se* plaintiff, Sepehr Torabi, filed an unopposed Motion to Consolidate the instant case  
18 with Case No. 09cv2945. This Court's review of both cases reveals that consolidation is not  
19 appropriate at this time. The Complaint in Case No. 09cv2945 was removed from the Superior  
20 Court of California, County of San Diego. However, only the first page of the Complaint is  
21 included in the removal papers. From the brief excerpt of the Complaint currently in the record,  
22 the Court cannot determine whether Case No. 09cv2945 is appropriate for consolidation with the  
23 instant matter. See F.R.C.P. 42(a).<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, plaintiff's Motion to Consolidate is DENIED

24 ///


25 ///

26 ///

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>1</sup>When actions involving a common question of law or fact are pending before the court, it may  
order a joint hearing or trial of any or all the matters in issue in the actions; it may order all the actions  
consolidated; and it may make such orders concerning proceedings therein as may tend to avoid  
unnecessary costs or delay.

1 WITHOUT PREJUDICE. Plaintiff may re-file their Motion to Consolidate once the entire  
2 Complaint in Case No. 09cv2945 has been filed with this Court.

3  
4  
5 Dated: March 30, 2011

  
John A. Houston  
United States District Judge